

Art Unit: 3691

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to the Applicant's response filed on 20 June 2008.
2. Claims 1, 5, and 9 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-16 are currently pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

4. With regard to the interview conducted 9 April 2008, the Examiner would like to thank the Applicant for attempting to address the discrepancies with the interpretations of the prior art of record relevant to the claim language. Although the Examiner does not concede the interpretation of the substance of the interview as reported by the Applicant, the Examiner will attempt to clearly illustrate how the claim language reads on the prior art of record.

5. **Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102**

6. Claim 1, as best understood by the Examiner, requires a new transaction document to be created in response to a command to edit an original transaction document, then modifying the new transaction document, and performing a posting of the new document data to the general ledger. Kaplan clearly illustrates this, in at least column 5, line 30 - column 6, line 67, where, at the request of a user to move an account (source account), the system creates a new account (target account) and modifies it to replicate the source account. The target account modification is then posted and saved to the general ledger balance table, nullifying the original source account postings in the general ledger. It is clear, from the Applicant's interpretation of the rejection and the interview, that the Kaplan reference was not contemplated in this reasonable manner. Accordingly, claim 1 remains rejected, as shown below.

7. With regard to claim 4, the Examiner points to the explanation provided above regarding claim 1 for clarification. Accordingly, claim 4 remains rejected, as shown below.

8. With regard to claim 5, the Examiner asserts that the Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection, necessitated by the Applicant's substantial amendments to the claimed invention.

9. With regard to claims 6-8, the Examiner points to the explanation provided above regarding claim 1 for clarification. Accordingly, claims 6-8 remain rejected, as shown below.

10. **Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103**

Art Unit: 3691

11. With regard to claims 2-3, the Examiner points to the explanation provided above regarding claim 1 for clarification. Accordingly, claims 2-3 remain rejected, as shown below.

12. With regard to claims 9-16, the Examiner points to the explanation provided above regarding claim 1 for clarification. Accordingly, claims 9-16 remain rejected, as shown below.

Previous Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

13. Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention was directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner appreciates the Applicant's prompt attention to these deficiencies and hereby withdraws such rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

15. Claims 1, 4, 6-9, 12, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Kaplan et al.*, *US Patent No. 6,584,453*.

As per claim 1

Kaplan teaches:

- a) generating a new transaction document that is a copy of the original transaction document in response to a command to edit the original transaction document (see at least column 5, lines 30-67; column 6, lines 1-38)
- b) modifying the new transaction document (see at least column 5, lines 30-67; column 6, lines 1-38)
- c) saving the modified new transaction document in the computer storage medium (see at least column 5, lines 30-67; column 6, lines 1-38)
- d) nullifying the original transaction postings in the general ledger (see at least column 5, lines 30-67; column 6, lines 1-38)
- e) posting transactions of the modified new transaction document in the general ledger (see at least column 5, lines 30-67; column 6, lines 1-38)

Art Unit: 3691

As per claims 4 and 6-7

Kaplan teaches the method of claim 1, as described above.

Kaplan further teaches:

- Wherein the posting step e) is performed in response to the saving step c) (see at least column 6, lines 20-31)
- Wherein the nullifying step d) includes posting one or more canceling transactions in the general ledger that nullify each of the original transaction postings in the general ledger (see at least column 5, lines 30-67; column 6, lines 1-38)
- Wherein the nullifying step d) includes voiding the original transaction postings in the general ledger (see at least column 5, lines 30-67; column 6, lines 1-38)

As per claim 8

Kaplan teaches the method of claim 7, as described above.

Kaplan further teaches:

- Including voiding the original transaction document (see at least column 5, lines 30-67; column 6, lines 1-38)

ADDITIONAL REJECTIONS

Claims 9, 12, and 14-16 are interpreted to encompass substantially the same scope as claims 1, 4 and 6-8. Accordingly, claims 9, 12, and 14-16 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claims 1, 4 and 6-8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 2-3, 5, 10-11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaplan*, in view of, *Land et al.*, *US Patent No. 6,807,533*.

As per claim 2

Kaplan teaches the method of claim 1, as described above.

Kaplan further teaches:

- Adjusting account balances and reconciling them with the general ledger (see at least column 4, lines 48-67; column 5, lines 1-27)

Kaplan does not teach:

- Wherein the modifying step b) includes adding, deleting, or changing a transaction in the new transaction document

Land teaches:

- Wherein the modifying step b) includes adding, deleting, or changing a transaction in the new transaction document (see at least column 10, lines 25-41)

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add the feature of Land to the teachings of Kaplan. One would have been motivated to do so to help facilitate account balancing at the appropriate time (see at least Land column 3, lines 9-17).

Art Unit: 3691

As per claim 3

Kaplan, in view of Land, teaches the method of claim 2, as described above.

Land further teaches:

- Wherein the modifying step b) includes applying a credit, applying a debit, modifying a quantity, or modifying a cost of the new transaction document (see at least column 10, lines 25-41)

As per claim 5

Kaplan teaches the method of claim 1, as described above.

Kaplan further teaches:

- Wherein the original transaction document is a journal entry (see at least column 4, lines 48-67; column 5, lines 1-27)

Kaplan does not teach:

- Wherein the original transaction document is selected from the group consisting of an invoice and a vendor bill

Land teaches:

- Wherein a transaction document is selected from the group consisting of an invoice and a vendor bill (see at least column 6, lines 6-41)

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add the feature of Land to the teachings of Kaplan. One would have been motivated to do so to help facilitate account balancing at the appropriate time (see at least Land column 3, lines 9-17).

ADDITIONAL REJECTIONS

Claims 10-11 and 13 are interpreted to encompass substantially the same scope as claims 2-3 and 5. Accordingly, claims 10-11 and 13 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claims 2-3 and 5.

Art Unit: 3691

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas M. Hammond III whose telephone number is 571-270-1829. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7AM - 5PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thomas M Hammond III
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3691
US Patent & Trademark Office
18 September 2008

/Hani M. Kazimi/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691

